

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LARAMIE LAWSON,

Defendant.

:

:

:

:

:

Case No. 3:22cr142

JUDGE WALTER H. RICE

DECISION AND ENTRY OVERRULING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR
REVIEW OF DETENTION ORDER (DOC. #24); REASONING SET FORTH

The Motion of the Defendant, seeking a review of the Detention Order (Doc. #24), is deemed by this Court to be not well taken and same is, therefore, OVERRULED in its entirety, based upon the following reasoning:

1. Given the nature of the charges against the Defendant and the penalties provided therefore, this is a presumption matter, the presumption being that there is no condition nor combination of conditions such as to “‘reasonably assure’ the Defendant’s appearance as required and to ‘reasonably assure’ the safety of any person and the community.” That presumption has not been rebutted.

2. Assuming, *arguendo*, that the presumption factor did not apply, this Court would, nonetheless, find that there exists no condition nor combination of conditions such as to reasonably assure the Defendant’s appearance as required and, further, to reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community.

3. According to the Pretrial Services Report, Defendant has three weapons charges on his record, and he had a warrant outstanding on a prior case, for failure to appear, which took some two and one-half months to serve upon him. He has one prior probation violation which ripened into a probation revocation and an eighteen-month sentence, not to mention other incidents of non-compliance with Court ordered supervision. A thorough reading of the criminal Complaint, verified by affidavit, indicates that a search of two residences for which the Defendant had dominion and control, revealed the presence of three loaded weapons, he previously had been stopped in the Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky Airport and was found to have in his possession \$19,580 in United States currency, at a time when he was unemployed and could not account for the money, and that paragraph 6 and 7 thereof set forth other indicia of drug distribution activity. Moreover, Defendant's counsel indicated, on the record, that he was hoping to finalize a plea agreement with the government that would result in a fifteen-year mandatory minimum sentence.

WHEREFORE, based upon the aforesaid, this Court finds not well taken and does, therefore, OVERRULE the Defendant's Motion for Review of Detention Order.

February 21, 2023



WALTER H. RICE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies to:

Counsel of Record
US Marshals Office